

REMARKS

By this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 21-29 to correct typographical errors and have added new claims 30 and 31. Applicants submit that no new material has been added by way of this amendment.


The Office Action rejected claims 21-29 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-27 of U.S. Patent No. 6,695,285. Applicant notes that the form paragraphs for statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) were included in the Office Action instead of the form paragraphs that correspond to obviousness-type double patenting. Applicant believes that the form paragraphs for statutory type double patenting were included in the Office Action by mistake. Applicant's Attorney, Ken Smith, contacted the Examiner's supervisor, Gene Mancene, on March 8, 2005 and explained the inconsistency between the rejection and the form paragraphs that were included (Applicant contacted the Examiner's supervisor because Examiner Hirsch has retired). The Examiner's supervisor agreed that form paragraphs for statutory type double patenting were probably included by mistake.

Rejections under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting can be overcome by filing a terminal disclaimer. Applicant submits the attached terminal disclaimer to overcome the obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Claims 21-29 are in condition for allowance.

Applicant also submits that new claims 30 and 31 are also in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 10, 2005



Leonard L. Lewis
Reg. No. 31,176
(216) 622-8683

Encl.: Terminal Disclaimer